

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 5-9 being independent claims.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida (U.S. Pat. No.6,161,026) in view of Cushman et al. (U.S. Pat. No.6,125,287) and further in view of Ahlberg et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,295).

Claims 5 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Seidensticker, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No.6,128,012) in view of Ahlberg et al. We note that the rejection as cited should be under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

It is gratefully acknowledged that independent Claims 6-9 are allowed.

Claims 1, 5 and 10 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Uchida in view of Cushman et al. and further in view of Ahlberg et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method comprising the steps of detecting whether a user has input a single scroll key corresponding to a menu, the single scroll key for menu scrolling in left, right, upward and downward directions, *the single scroll key being any one key of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal and operation of the single scroll key being defined solely with a single or consecutive inputs of the single scroll key.*

Uchida discloses a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method relying on a single specific key 10 (FIG. 1, col. 3 lines 49-57). The Examiner stipulates in the Office Action on page 5 lines 12-13 that Uchida does not disclose “the key being any one of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal.” Further, the operation of the single specific key 10 of Uchida is not defined solely with a single or consecutive inputs of the key 10, in contrast to the

operation of the scroll key of the present invention (Specification page 6 lines 21-25). Uchida fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key being any one key of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal and operation of the single scroll key being defined solely with a single or consecutive inputs of the single scroll key* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Cushman et al. discloses a wireless telephone having an improved user interface, the telephone using a dedicated “OPTions” key for menu scrolling by activating the OPTions key “to change the current function assignments for the arrow keys” (FIG.1, col. 3 lines 10-27), namely the “four function keys in the shape of up, down, left and right arrows” (FIG. 1, col. 2 lines 62-63). In Cushman et al., the operation of a scroll key requires activation of the OPTions key and at least one of the “four function keys in the shape of up, down, left and right arrows” (FIG. 1, col. 2 lines 62-63). By contrast, the operation of the scroll key of the present invention requires solely a single input or consecutive inputs of the scroll key. Cushman et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key being any one key of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal and operation of the single scroll key being defined solely with a single or consecutive inputs of the single scroll key* taught by Amended Claim 1, and thus fails to cure the defects of Uchida.

Ahlberg et al. discloses a sole 4-way scroll key for menu scrolling (FIGs 3A-3B, col. 9 line 63 through col. 10 line 17). The scroll key of Ahlberg et al. is not any key on the terminal and the operation of the scroll key is not defined solely with a single or consecutive inputs of the scroll key, in contrast to the present invention. Ahlberg et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key being any one key of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal and operation of the single scroll key being defined solely with a single or consecutive inputs of the single scroll key* taught by Amended Claim 1, and thus fails to cure the defects of Uchida and Cushman et al.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Uchida, Cushman et al., Ahlberg et al., or any combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), more properly under 35

U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Seidensticker, Jr. et al. in view of Ahlberg et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 5 teaches, in part, a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method comprising detecting whether a user has set a scroll function when displaying a menu screen; if so, detecting whether an input state of a single scroll key set for a scroll function is maintained for a predetermined period of time, *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in at least one of left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key of a plurality of keys including alphanumeric keys.*

Seidensticker, Jr. et al. discloses a key input method for menu scrolling, the method relying on a keypad 36 comprising *four* single scroll keys 38, 40, 42 and 44 for scrolling directions (FIGs. 1-2 and 8; col. 5 lines 7-20; col. 9 line 63 through col. 10 line 17; col. 12 line 63 through col. 13 line 41). In Seidensticker, Jr. et al., each of the four single scroll keys 38, 40, 42 and 44 can scroll only in one direction. Further, none of them is one of alphanumeric keys. In contrast, the single scroll key of the present invention can menu scroll in left, right, upward and downward directions, and be any one key of alphanumeric keys. Further, operation of the single scroll key cited in Amended Claim 5 depends solely on a maintenance of a key input state of the single scroll key (Specification at page 7 lines 1-2 and page 8 lines 20-23). Seidensticker, Jr. et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in at least one of left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key of a plurality of keys including alphanumeric keys* taught by Amended Claim 5.

Ahlberg et al. discloses a sole 4-way scroll key dedicated for menu scrolling (FIGs 3A-3B, col. 9 line 63 through col. 10 line 17). None of alphanumeric keys in Ahlberg et al. is able to perform menu scrolling. Ahlberg et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in at least one of left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key of a plurality of keys including alphanumeric keys* taught by Amended Claim 5, and thus fails to cure the defects of Seidensticker, Jr. et al.

Clearly, Amended Claim 5 structurally differs from Seidensticker, Jr. et al., Ahlberg et

al., or the combination thereof.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-11, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

The Farrell Law Firm  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel 516-228-3565  
Fax 516-228-8475

PJF/DGL/mk